

05-26-06

DAC  
SFW



IN THE US PATENT AND TM OFFICE

Appn. Number: 10/017,280

Filing Date : 2001 Dec 07

Applicants : Zemlyakov, Vladimir and McDonough, Patrick

Appn. Title : Upper Extremity Exoskeleton Structure and Method

Examiner : Yu, Justine Romand/GAU 3764

Mailed 2006, May 25, Thurs.

At North Andover, MA

Mail Stop Petition

Commissioner for Patents

P.O. Box 1450

Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Please, consider the following as a response to the Office of Petitions Letter mailed March 30, 2006:

1. The Office of Petitions Letter informs Applicants that the Petition is dismissed because Applicants did not file a response to the Interview Summary with Notice of Allowability, and, therefore, Applicants failed to file a timely reply as required. As well, the Office of Petitions Letter asserts, "Petitioners should have filed a separate reply to the Notice of Allowability". Further, the Letter cites the

statement from the Interview Summary, "THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW."

But the Interview Summary is formalized statement of the Interview, and the Notice of Allowability is formalized conclusions of the Interview. So the Interview is primarily.

2. Applicants had the Telephone Interview with Examiner on August 5, 2003. Examiner and Applicants discussed requirements and details comprising in the non-final Office action mailed on July 16, 2003, and an agreement was reached. According to statement above, Applicants had a choice either to send formal response just after the Interview date, or wait for receiving of this Interview Summary that was later. Applicants' reply including the substance of the interview was sent on August 7, 2003 immediately after Interview date prior to the Interview Summary with the Notice of Allowability. The Interview Summary was mailed by the Office on August 6, 2003 and received by Applicants several days later. Therefore, Applicants could not wait for receiving of this Interview Summary and reply to the Notice of Allowability separately. So, Applicants respectfully assert that the formal reply, including the corrected drawings, was sent timely.

3. The corrected drawings, which were reviewed by the Office, were copies but not originals. These copies were sent to the Office as reference. Perhaps, copies could be differed from the originals. Applicants are respectfully sending other copies of corrected drawings, and Applicants

hope that these copies will meet requirements of the Notice of Draftperson's Patent Drawing Review.


4. Applicants have received from the Office the Notice of Allowance and Fee(s) Due mailed August 6, 2003. Applicants have sent the formal reply including the substance of the Interview and requirements of the non-final Office action with corrected drawings mailed August 7, 2003. Applicants have sent Issue and Publication Fees (\$ 950.00) mailed September 17, 2003. But Applicants have not received issued Patent.

5. Considering the above, Applicants respectfully request to withdraw Holding of the Abandonment and issue the Patent.

Very respectfully,

Vladimir Zemlyakov

May 25, 2006

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Vladimir Zemlyakov", is written over a horizontal line. The signature is fluid and cursive.

Enclosed: corrected drawings (2pp.).



### CERTIFICATE OF MAILING

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service as First Class Mail in the envelope addressed to:

Mail Stop Petition

Commissioner For Patents

P.O. Box 1450

Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

On May 25, 2006

Vladimir Zemlyakov

Signature 

Date 05.25.06



Annotated Sheet Showing Changes




FIG. 14




FIG. 15

Annotated Sheet Showing Changes

